

California Department of Parks and Recreation

Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook Project CEQA Initial Study

- 1. Project title:** Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook Project
- 2. Lead agency:** California Department of Parks and Recreation
Southern Service Center
8885 Rio San Diego Drive, No. 270
San Diego, CA 92108
Phone: 619-688-3354
- 3. Contact person:** Ron Saenz, Associate Parks and Recreation Specialist
- 4. Project location:** The Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook site is located in the Baldwin Hills in southwest Los Angeles County. The project site falls within the limits of the City of Culver City, while at the base of the hill are residential and commercial developments which are divided up between the Cities of Culver City, Los Angeles, and Inglewood. The 58-acre Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook site is located in the northwest portion of the 387-acre Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area (SRA). The site is within the 127-square mile Ballona Creek Watershed, and is adjacent to Ballona Creek and the Ballona Creek Trail. A vicinity map is shown on Figure 1.
- 5. General plan designation:** Kenneth Hahn SRA General Plan, State Park designation
- 6. Zoning:** State Park
- 7. Description of project:** The proposed project would develop the Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook for use as a recreational area, as well as a natural resource educational park for park visitors and local schools. The project has four elements: develop public access to the property, provide parking for visitors, construct a visitor center, and provide protection and interpretation of the natural and cultural resources of the park and the adjacent Ballona Creek. The project would restore the ridgelines and topography that were previously graded, and would emphasize restoration of native coastal sage scrub habitat. A site plan is shown on Figure 2.
- 8. Surrounding land uses and setting:** The proposed project is located in designated parkland in the northwest portion of Kenneth Hahn SRA, elevated above the adjacent Cities of Los Angeles, Inglewood, and Culver City. The Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook is set in a natural environment with a number of sensitive vegetation communities, wildlife, and plants, set apart from the surrounding urban environment. The surrounding cities are intensely commercially and residentially developed and densely populated. The site is approximately 2 miles north of the Interstate 405 and State Route 90 interchange.

9. Other public agencies whose approval is required: (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

In addition to approval granted by the Department, the following approvals of other public agencies are required:

- Regional Water Quality Control Board (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the applicant. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date November 12, 2003

Printed Name Ron Saenz

This page intentionally left blank.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?		X		
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X		
e. Create a new source of substantial shade or shadow that would adversely affect daytime views in the area?			X	
<p>The project site is itself a scenic viewpoint, providing panoramic vistas from the San Gabriel Mountains to Catalina Island, most of the Santa Monica Mountains and the Los Angeles Basin, and all of Santa Monica Bay from Point Dume to the Palos Verdes Peninsulas. The Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook is located on top of a hill, elevated above the surrounding passive recreation opportunities at Kenneth Hahn SRA. At the base of the hill are residential and commercial developments in the surrounding cities of Los Angeles, Inglewood, and Culver City. The location of the visitor center, roads, and parking lots has the potential to impact the existing views to and from the park. This issue will be further analyzed in the EIR.</p> <p>There are no designated state scenic highways near the project site; the nearest designated state scenic highway is the Angeles Crest Highway (Highway 2), located approximately 18 miles northwest of the project site in the San Gabriel Mountains. Therefore, impacts related to scenic highways would not occur. The project would improve access and restore the ridgelines and topography of the site, which would improve the scenic resources available at the park. The proposed project is intended to improve the visual character of the park through restoration and improvement of the project site, which would not adversely alter the existing visual character of the park. The new scenic overlook would also provide public access to magnificent views of Los Angeles.</p> <p>The new visitor center proposed for the project has the potential to create a source of substantial light or glare above the existing conditions. This issue will be further analyzed in the EIR. The new visitor center would create a new source of shade and shadow; however, the new shade and shadow would not substantially affect daytime views. No further evaluation of this issue is necessary.</p>				

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson act contract?				X
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X
The proposed project area is designated as parkland by the Department. There is no designated farmland within the project area; therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of farmland, nor would impacts to Prime, Unique, or Statewide Important Farmland occur. Similarly, no conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural uses would occur. No further evaluation is necessary.				
3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X		
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X		
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
<p>The project is located in the South Coast Air Basin, which is designated nonattainment for state particulate matter (PM₁₀), ozone, and carbon monoxide (CO) standards, and federal ozone, CO, and PM₁₀ standards.</p> <p>Air quality impacts from construction of the visitor center, roads, and parking areas will be evaluated using the thresholds of significance established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and presented in the <i>CEQA Air Quality Handbook</i> (SCAQMD 1993). Short-term emissions would result from the use of construction equipment and trips generated by construction workers and haul/material delivery trucks. Long-term emissions would result from the trips generated by the increase in park use. These emissions, which may potentially increase pollutant concentrations in the area, may result in the violation of air quality standards or the exceedance of air quality thresholds of significance, which may contribute to the existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, air quality impacts will be further evaluated in the EIR to determine the level of significance.</p> <p>Additionally, sensitive receptors, including park users and nearby residences are located in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Construction and operation of the proposed project may expose these sensitive receptors to increased pollutant concentrations. Further evaluation will be provided in the EIR.</p>				
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X		
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
<p>The project site is a large open space area in the Baldwin Hills, a series of hills, ridgelines, and canyons situated above the surrounding developed and densely populated cities of Los Angeles, Inglewood, and Culver City. The Baldwin Hills provide a natural habitat where large stands of native coastal sage scrub habitat and associated wildlife occur. Two other distinct vegetation communities, grasslands and riparian woodlands, also occur within the park. These vegetation communities support a diverse number of sensitive plant and wildlife species that have the potential to be impacted by the proposed project. The project area serves as a corridor for wildlife movement. As such, the proposed project may result in impacts to wildlife dispersal and migration corridors during and post construction of the visitor center and access road. The project proposes to restore native habitat and preserve the park resources; however, construction of the new facilities and increased park use have the potential to adversely impact sensitive species, sensitive natural communities, and wildlife movement. A detailed biological resources technical report will be prepared for the project. The technical report will be included as an appendix to the EIR and the results of the biological resource surveys will be summarized and presented in the EIR. If necessary, mitigation measures will be provided in the technical report to address potential impacts to biological resources resulting from the project.</p> <p>The proposed project would not impact an area that represents a federally protected wetland, nor would it interfere with any local policies, ordinances, or adopted conservation plans protecting biological resources. No further evaluation of these issues is necessary.</p>				
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?				X

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?		X		
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		
<p>The proposed project is located in an area with a rich historical and natural history. The proposed project would involve roadway improvements, two pervious surface parking lots, and subsurface excavation for the visitor center. Significant archaeological and paleontological resources may be uncovered during construction and site excavation. Development of the proposed project has the potential to significantly impact cultural resources. A records search, site survey, and cultural resources technical report will be prepared for the project. The technical report will be included as an appendix to the EIR and the results of the site survey will be summarized and presented in the EIR. If necessary, mitigation measures will be provided in the technical report to address potential impacts to cultural resources resulting from the project.</p>				
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		X		
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		X		
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		X		
iv) Landslides?		X		
b. Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?			X	

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X		
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?		X		
<p>The Baldwin Hills are northwest trending ridgelines formed by the warping of sedimentary rock deposits as a result of movement within the Newport-Inglewood Structural Zone (State of California 2002). The hills extend over 500 feet above the Los Angeles plain. The Baldwin Hills are within 1-mile of the Newport-Inglewood fault system, and the Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook is the highest elevation of the Newport-Inglewood Structural Zone at 511 feet. As the project area is near the Newport-Inglewood fault, the proposed visitor center would be located on an unstable geologic unit, which has the potential to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects, including landslides. In addition, the site is susceptible to expansive soils, ground shaking, erosion, and liquefaction. A geologic technical report will be prepared for the project. The results of the site survey will be summarized and presented in the EIR. If necessary, mitigation measures will be provided in the technical report to address potential seismic-related impacts resulting from the project. It is anticipated that implementation of the site-specific mitigation measures and adherence to all applicable seismic design codes and building requirements would reduce impacts related to geology and soils to a less than significant level.</p> <p>A portion of the Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook site is located on the former Hetzler Landfill, located on the southern portion of the property. The former landfill site is currently a graded, flat surface. The proposed project would balance the fill material taken from the roadway improvements and the visitor center on top of the former landfill, thereby restoring the original ridgeline contours. No impacts related to hazards at the former landfill site would occur.</p>				
7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>The proposed project would not create any use that would involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. As the project area would remain in its current use as parkland and open space, it is not anticipated that any impacts associated with the use of hazardous materials and the generation of hazardous waste would occur. The site is, however, located near the Inglewood Oil Field, which covers approximately 700 acres across the Baldwin Hills. Three abandoned oil wells are located on the project site. The oil wells are located east of the proposed visitor center and ridgeline improvements. Roadway improvements and construction of the parking areas and visitor center would not be located on or near the abandoned oil well sites. It is not anticipated that hazards related to oil wells would occur.</p> <p>While there are several schools in the vicinity of the proposed project, the Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook is not located within a quarter mile of any schools. Classrooms and students would frequent the park for educational purposes; however, park operations would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or hazardous materials, substances, or waste, which would affect these park users.</p> <p>The Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Accordingly, no impacts related to such sites would occur.</p> <p>The project site is not located within a two-mile radius of any public airport or private airstrip. As such, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.</p> <p>The proposed project would not interfere with any current emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans for local, state, or federal agencies. Access to all local roads would be maintained during construction and project operation, and access to the site would be improved with implementation of the proposed project. Any emergency procedures or design features required by local, state, and federal guidelines would be implemented during construction and operation of the proposed project.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, the project site is located in an undeveloped natural area surrounded by dense urban development. Fire protection services would not be affected by the project. Accordingly, the proposed project would not contribute to wildland fire hazards.</p> <p>Because no impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would occur as a result of the project, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.</p>				

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>The Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook is located in some of the last undeveloped open space remaining in the 127 square mile Ballona Creek Watershed. The hillsides in the park drain into Ballona Creek and its tributary, Centinela Creek, which continue through the Ballona Wetlands and then into Santa Monica Bay. Stormwater runoff from the site currently drains into culverts and collection systems along La Cienega Avenue.</p> <p>During construction, adherence to all applicable water quality requirements would be necessary. Because construction activities would disturb greater than one acre of land, the project would be required to comply with the RWQCB's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II Rule. Implementation of these requirements, including preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would ensure that water quality impacts during construction would be less than significant. In addition, park use and development is not anticipated to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or exceed the capacity of collection systems in La Cienega Avenue.</p> <p>Due to the elevation of the Baldwin Hills above the surrounding water table, they are excluded from the surrounding Los Angeles Basin as a significant source of groundwater. Any water collected on site is relatively unpolluted, as the unpaved nature of the park results in most of the runoff and rain percolating into the soil, rather than flowing over streets, parking lots, and highways and collecting a pollution load. The minor increase in impervious surface area would not significantly alter drainage patterns, nor would it significantly increase polluted runoff originating from the site.</p> <p>The project site is not located within the FEMA 100-year flood hazard area. There are no dams on the site that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. No impacts from flooding are expected to occur.</p> <p>Due to the distance of the project site to the Pacific Ocean (approximately 5 miles northwest of the project site) and the elevation above mean sea level (approximately 500 feet), there is virtually no risk of on-site hazard due to seiches, tsunamis (seismically-induced waves), or mudflow.</p> <p>Because the project would not result in impacts to hydrology and water quality, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.</p>				
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?				X

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
<p>The park improvements would occur within the existing park boundaries and no houses would be affected. Accordingly, no communities would be physically divided by the park improvements.</p> <p>The project site is located in Culver City on State-owned land. The project site is covered under the Kenneth Hahn SRA General Plan Amendment (2002). Use at the project site would not change from the adopted use in the Kenneth Hahn SRA General Plan. In addition, the project area is in the City of Culver City. The land use designation of the project area would not change from the existing land use designation. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the applicable land use plan. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans for the project area. No impacts would occur.</p>				
10. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
<p>There are no known mineral deposits of economic importance underlying the project site. Development of the visitor center, roadways, and restoration activities would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource. No further evaluation of this issue is required in the EIR.</p>				

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X		
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X		
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<p>Construction of the visitor center and other improvements would intermittently generate high noise levels on and adjacent to the project site. Construction noise would potentially disturb recreational users at the project site and Kenneth Hahn SRA park users and nearby sensitive receptors. Construction activities would occur over a 12-month period. Construction noise would be a short-term adverse effect of the project, which would be mitigated to the extent feasible. Traffic generated noise levels in the vicinity of the project site as a result of the proposed project would also increase, which may significantly impact sensitive receptors in the project area. Noise impacts generated by the construction and operation of the proposed project and their effects on adjacent sensitive receptors will be further evaluated in the EIR.</p> <p>There are no public airports or private airstrips in the project vicinity. Accordingly, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to aircraft noise. No further evaluation of this issue is required.</p>				

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p>The site for the proposed project is currently open space with no residential development. No housing units or persons would be displaced as a result of the park improvements, nor would the project necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere. The proposed project would result in increased use of the property; however, improved park access and construction of a visitor center would not induce substantial population growth in the surrounding densely populated area. Increased availability of the park will help to meet the existing need for recreational open space. Nor further evaluation of this issue is required in the EIR.</p>				
13. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?				X
ii) Police protection?				X
iii) Schools?				X
iv) Parks?				X
v) Other public facilities?				X

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>Fire and police protection for this portion of Kenneth Hahn SRA is currently provided by the City of Culver City and the County of Los Angeles. The increase in park users would not result in the need for additional fire station or police department facilities. The increase in use at the park would accommodate an existing need for parkland and would not induce population growth in the area. Consequently, existing fire and police protection levels would not be substantially affected by implementation of the proposed project. No new or altered government facilities would be required.</p> <p>The educational and interpretive programs planned for the park would be a benefit to local schools. The proposed project would not result in the need for new school facilities. No impacts to schools and other public facilities are anticipated to result from project implementation. No further evaluation of impacts to public services is required in the EIR.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 14, Recreation, for a discussion of the project's effects on nearby parks. Impacts to recreational facilities would be less than significant.</p>				
14. RECREATION.				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
c. Would the project affect existing recreational opportunities?				X
<p>This project would result in the increase use of the scenic overlook site; however, it would also result in improvements to existing park facilities and the construction of a visitor center and new parking areas. Accordingly, the project would result in improvements, and would not result in substantial physical deterioration of the existing park. The impacts associated with construction of the visitor center and other facilities with regard to other environmental impact areas will be discussed in the EIR. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not impact existing recreational opportunities at Kenneth Hahn SRA. No further evaluation of impacts to recreation is required in the EIR.</p>				

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	X			
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		X		
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X	

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>Principal highway access routes to the park include Interstate 10 to the north, State Route 187 to the west, and State Route 90 and Interstate 405 to the south and west. Access to the Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook can be gained via Hetzler Road and Jefferson Boulevard. The proposed project would generate construction-related traffic on the local roadway network for several weeks. This includes personal vehicles of construction workers and truck trips related to debris hauling and import of construction materials. In addition, the improved access and increased use of the park has the potential to increase traffic at local intersections and roadways. This would change traffic circulation in the project area and would affect the volume to capacity (V/C) ratios and the levels of service (LOS) at local intersections and roadways. A full transportation analysis will be conducted for the proposed project; the report will be summarized in the EIR, and the full report will be included as an appendix to the EIR.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed parking would be adequate to serve the needs of park users; however, a parking analysis will be included in the EIR to fully analyze impacts associated with parking. The results of the parking analysis will also be summarized in the EIR.</p> <p>The proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns or result in any air safety risks, nor would it conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No further evaluation of these issues is required in the EIR.</p>				
16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	
<p>Park use is not anticipated to produce a significant amount of wastewater that would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, nor would it exceed the capacity of existing sewage systems. In addition, the use of irrigation water at the proposed project site would be similar to the existing water use levels at the park. No new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities would occur as a result of the project.</p> <p>The proposed project would not substantially increase storm water runoff from the site, as the project would result in a minor increase in impervious surface area. The majority of the runoff from the project site percolates into the soil; this would not substantially change as a result of the proposed project.</p> <p>It is anticipated that a large amount of the construction debris would be recycled. Those materials that could not be recycled would be disposed of at nearby landfills. Disposal and recycling of the construction debris would be required to comply with all federal, state, and local regulations, and no impacts would occur. In addition, project operation would not create substantial amounts of solid waste. No further evaluation of these issues is required in the EIR.</p>				
17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		
<p>The park improvements would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Also, the project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Instead, the proposed project would provide for protection and interpretation of the natural and cultural resources of the park. Less than significant impacts would occur.</p> <p>The project would not result in significant cumulative impacts. It is anticipated that the project may occur at the same time as other projects in the area; however, the incremental effect of this project would not be cumulatively considerable. The areas to the north and west of the site are generally fully developed and the south and east are largely occupied by parkland and oil fields; hence, the potential for large projects in the immediate area is low.</p> <p>The proposed project has the potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Further analysis will be provided in the EIR to determine potentially significant impacts and identify mitigation measure that would reduce impacts to the extent feasible.</p>				